

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
NEW DELHI**

**Petition No.188/MP/2019 along with IA No. 66/2019**

- Subject : Petition under Section 79(1)(f) of the Electricity Act, 2003 for adjudication of disputes arising out of and in relation to the Power Sale Agreement (PSA) dated 15.9.2006 between erstwhile Punjab State Electricity Board, i.e. the predecessor of Punjab State Power Corporation Ltd. (PSPCL) and PTC India Ltd. (PTC) for purchase of 340 MW of power from 1200 MW Teesta-III Hydro-electric Project of Teesta Urja Limited pursuant to the PPA dated 28.7.2006 between PTC and TUL and the BPTA dated 4.6.2010 signed between PGCIL, PSPCL, other Discoms of Uttar Pradesh, Rajasthan & Haryana and PTC.
- Petitioner : PTC India Ltd. (PTCIL) and Anr.
- Respondent : Punjab State Power Corporation Limited (PSPCL) and Anr.
- Date of Hearing : **21.2.2024**
- Coram : Shri Jishnu Barua, Chairperson  
Shri Arun Goyal, Member  
Shri P. K. Singh, Member
- Parties Present : Shri Ravi Kishore, Advocate, PTCIL  
Shri Keshav Singh, Advocate, PTCIL  
Ms. Suparna Srivastava, Advocate, CTUIL  
Shri Tushar Mathur, CTUIL  
Ms. Divya Sharma, CTUIL  
Shri Bhaswa Prabhu Patil, Sr. Advocate, TUL  
Shri Vidhan Vyas, Advocate, TUL  
Ms Swati Jindal, TUL  
Shri Jaideep Lakhtakia, TUL  
Shri Rakesh Singh, TUL  
Shri Shubham Arya, Advocate, PSPCL  
Ms. Reeha Singh, Advocate, PSPCL  
Shri Devyanshu Sharma, Advocate, PSPCL

**Record of Proceedings**

At the outset, the learned counsel for Respondent, PSPCL submitted that PSPCL is trying to resolve the issue and sought liberty to file an additional affidavit to bring on record the subsequent developments which have taken place in the matter.

2. Learned senior counsel appearing on behalf of Teesta Urja Limited (TUL) submitted that no consensus has been reached between the TUL and PSPCL so far despite a number of discussions. Learned senior counsel, as such, did not object to the request of Respondent, PSPCL for filing the additional affidavit. However, the learned senior counsel prayed that the matter be listed for final arguments.

3. Learned counsel for the Respondent, CTUIL, submitted that this Commission in its various orders, has held that relinquishment charges were nothing but a species of transmission charges and were liable to be paid by the long-term customer in case of relinquishment of LTOA. Since in the instant case Petitioner No.1, PTC was the LTOA customer on whom the liability to pay transmission charges devolved, PTC also became liable to pay the relinquishment charges for the relinquished access rights. Learned counsel further submitted that if any consensus is reached between the parties for any future transaction, then the party (s) is required to apply for a fresh LTA.

4. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the parties, the Commission permitted the Respondent, PSPCL, to file its additional affidavit within three weeks with an advance copy to the other side who may file their response thereon, if any, within two weeks thereafter. Meanwhile, the parties are directed to complete the pleadings before the next date of the hearing. No adjournment will be allowed in future.

5. The Petition, along with IA, will be listed for the **final hearing on 29.5.2024.**

**By order of the Commission**

**Sd/-  
(T.D. Pant)  
Joint Chief (Law)**